**Defendants** 

THE LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT P. SPRETNAK A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 8275 S. EASTERN AVENUE SUITE 200

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89123

28

[ECF No. 36]

(SECOND REQUEST)

1

Plaintiff TERRY CHI, by and through her attorney Robert P. Spretnak, Esq.; Defendants CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada; MARY "MARE" MAZUR, in her official capacity and in her individual capacity; CEDRIC COLE, in his official capacity and in his individual capacity; JESUS JARA, in his official capacity; and BRENDA LARSEN-MITCHELL, in her official capacity, by and through their attorneys Ethan D. Thomas, Esq., Diana G. Dickinson, Esq., and Luke W. Molleck, Esq.; and Defendant SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC TELEVISION, a Nevada nonprofit corporation, by and through its attorneys Rusty Graf, Esq., and Paul E. Larsen, Esq.; do hereby stipulate and agree to extend the deadline for Plaintiff TERRY CHI to file her points and authorities in opposition to the following motions to dismiss: (1) Defendants Clark County School District, Mary "Mare" Mazur, Cedric Cole, Jesus Jara, and Brenda Larsen-Mitchell's Partial Motion To Dismiss [ECF No. 22]; and (2) Defendant Southern Nevada Public Television's Motion To Dismiss [ECF No. 24] for an additional 17 days, to March 17, 2025. This is the second request to extend the time for filing points and authorities in opposition to these motions to dismiss. The first motion to dismiss, ECF No. 22, was filed on January 10, 2025, and, therefore, pursuant to LR 7-2(b), the original deadline for the opposition to that dispositive motion was **January 24, 2025.** The second motion to dismiss, ECF No. 24, was filed on January 14, 2025, and, therefore, pursuant to LR 7-2(b), the original deadline for the opposition to that dispositive motion was **January 28, 2025**. By prior Stipulation and Order, as approved by this Court, ECF No. 28, these deadlines were extended to February 28, 2025.

There is good cause for this additional extension.

In the period of since the original deadlines for filing these motions, the schedule for the attorney for Ms. Chi has been completely filled. Ms. Chi's attorney is a solo practitioner. He was on a scheduled vacation, outside the United States, from January 28, 2025, to February 11, 2025. Upon his return two weeks ago, he prepared and filed oppositions to three dispositive motions in a related case pending in the Clark County District Court, *Terry Chi v. Mary "Mare" Mazur, an individual; Debra Solt, an individual; Douglas Bradford, an individual; Michele Kane, an* 

28

individual; and Sun City Anthem Community Association, Inc., a Nevada non-profit corporation, Case No. A-24-901963-C. He also attended a deposition in another matter. He has to prepare Early Neutral Evaluation settlement conference statements in two matters pending before this Court, including this case. He has to prepare initial disclosures in this matter prior to the upcoming settlement, which will involve the review and processing of a substantial amount of documentation as part of that process. Thus, counsel has maintained a very full schedule in the period of time covered by the first extension request.

Counsel is asking for an additional 17 days, to March 17, 2025, because he will be out of the office the week of March 3, 2025. The following week, the week of March 10, 2025, counsel has two settlement conferences and another settlement conference statement due.

The length of time for the extension is further necessitated by the fact that counsel for Ms. Chi is scheduled to be on vacation, out of the country, from January 28, 2025, to February 11, 2025, for a trip that has been postponed once and cannot be postponed or cancelled without incurring a substantial expense.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff Terry Chi asks for an extension of time to file her points and authorities in opposition to the two pending motions to dismiss in this matter before this Court.

Moreover, the parties further stipulate that defendants shall have an additional two weeks to file their respective reply briefs. This is necessitated by the complexity of this matter, specifically in terms of the number of claims at issue, and due to the work schedules of the counsels of record for the defendants. Under LR 7-2(b), reply briefs ordinarily would be seven days after the filing of an opposition brief. In light of the aforementioned extension for Plaintiff Terry Chi to file her points and authorities in opposition to the two pending motions to dismiss, any reply brief in support of either motion would be on March 24, 2025, by operation of LR 7-2(b).

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	The parties agree that the defendants have until April 7, 2025, to file their respective reply	
2	briefs in support of their motions to dism	iss.
3		
4	DATED: February 27, 2025.	DATED: February 27, 2025.
5	LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT P. SPRET	NAK LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
6	By: <u>/s/ Robert P. Spretnak</u> Robert P. Spretnak, Esq. (Bar No. 513	By: /s/ Díana 4. Díckinson Ethan D. Thomas, Esq. (Bar No. 12874)
7	8275 S. Eastern Avenue, Suite 200	Diana G. Dickinson, Esq. (Bar No. 13477) Luke W. Molleck, Esq. (Bar No. 14405)
8	Las Vegas, Nevada 89123	3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 300
9	Attorney for Plaintiff Terry Chi	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5937
10		Attorneys for Defendants Clark County School District, Mary "Mare" Mazur, Cedric Cole,
11		Jesus Jara, and Brenda Larsen-Mitchell
12		DATED: February 27, 2025.
13		By: /s/ Paul E. Larsen
14		Rusty Graf, Esq. (Bar No. 6322) Paul E. Larsen, Esq. (Bar No. 3756)
15		10777 W. Twain Avenue, Suite 300
16		Las Vegas, Nevada 89135
17		Attorneys for Defendant Southern Nevada Public Television
18		
19		
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
21		
22	UN	ITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23	DA	ΓΕΦ; March 3, 2025
24		V
25		
26		
27		
28		
ICES OF		

Page 4 of 4

THE LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT P. SPRETNAK A PROPESSIONAL CORPORATION 8275 S. EASTERN AVENUE SUITE 200 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89123